REMARKS

Objection to the drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Claim 21 was amended to overcome the Examiners rejection and claim 22 was cancelled. Reconsideration of the examiner's objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Objection to the title

The Examiner objected to the title. The title has been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 9-15, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claims 9-15, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant believes the claims are not indefinite and offers the following explanation to better understand the context of the claims. A register file includes a copy of registers for each thread to facilitate multithreading. A register file bit as claimed herein is a portion of a register file. Each bit of the register file has a circuit as described and claimed herein as a "register bit". For example, a secondary thread "bit" is loaded into the primary latch 410 and then moved to the secondary latch 420 (See Figure 4 and page 5, line 26 through page 6 line 1). The latches 410 and 420 hold a single bit of the register file. Thus a register file bit is replicated to build a register file. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 was amended to refer to a swap gate control input on the primary latch rather than the swap signal that was objected to by the Examiner. Basis for this change can be found on page 5, lines 16-19. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 was amended to more clearly show that there is a first value that is loaded into the primary latch, then moved into the secondary latch. A second value is then loaded into the primary latch. Then the swap is between the second value in the primary latch and the first value in the secondary latch.

Claim 21 was also amended to show that the steps are performed for just the selected one of the secondary latches. The steps could be performed for each of the latches to load the secondary latches with a value since that is the only way to load the latches (see page 4, line 25 to page 5, line 2). The description of Figure 5 does not detail how to load all the secondary registers, and since only loading one secondary register is consistent with the description of claim 5 to perform the invention, claim 21 has been amended accordingly. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 9-15 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-17 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Henry. Applicant traverses the Examiner's finding of anticipation of the claims as amended. Henry teaches a method and apparatus for exchanging operands within a microprocessor. However, Henry teaches exchanging from a primary register R1 with a single secondary register R2. Applicant believes the cited art does not teach or suggest the claimed invention as amended herein.

7

Claim 9

The Examiner cites Henry (col. 6, line 40 through col. 7, line 47) for the claim limitation of "the data on the data output of the primary latch to be written to a selected one of the plurality of secondary latches, and that causes the data on the data output of the selected one secondary latch to be written to the primary latch." As stated by the Examiner, this section of Henry apparently teaches to exchange the contents of R1 with the contents of R2. However, Henry, and in particular the cited section does not teach or suggest anything concerning a plurality of secondary latches. In Henry there are only two latches - so a primary latch and a single secondary latch. The Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of anticipation because Henry does not teach or suggest a plurality of secondary latches. For this reason, claim 9 is allowable, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 10-15

Claims 10-15 depend on claim 9, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claims 10-15 are allowable as depending on allowable independent claims.

Claim 21

Claim 21 includes limitations similar to claim 9 discussed above. The discussion above for claim 9 is included here by reference. Henry does not teach or suggest a plurality of secondary latches and selecting one of the plurality of secondary latches for performing a context switch with the primary latch, as recited in claims 9 and 21. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim 22

Claim 22 was cancelled.

Request to the Examiner

Applicant requests that the Examiner include the Henry reference on the Notice of References Cited.

Conclusion

In summary, none of the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, teach, support, or suggest the unique combination of features in applicant's claims presently on file. Therefore, applicant respectfully asserts that all of applicant's claims are allowable. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By   /bretjpetersen/
          Bret J. Petersen
          Reg. No. 37,417

MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 548
Carthage, MO 64836-0548
(417) 358-4700